

The Bible

IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN THOUGHT.

BATES.

BS500
.B32

3, 12, '01

Library of the Theological Seminary

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division... BS500

Section... B32

The Bible in the Light of Modern Thought.

A SERMON

—BY—

✓
REV. WILLIAM H. BATES, D. D.,

Preached at his Morning Service,

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1900,

—IN THE—

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

—AT—

WEBSTER GROVES, MO.

(Printed by Request.)

SERMON.

Gen. 2:16, 17, "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying: Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Gen. 3:4, "And the serpent said unto the woman, Thou shalt not surely die."

This discourse on "The Bible in the Light of Modern Thought," is, as you are aware, the result of an address on the same subject, by Rabbi Leon Harrison, at the recent meeting of our Tuesday Evening Club.

Seldom does a speaker so charm an audience as did he, and seldom does an audience evince so much of delight. We were all fascinated with the brilliancy of his rhetoric, the chasteness of his imagery, the felicity of his phrasings. The glowing portraiture, at the outset of his discourse, of the race which he in his own person represented, and the panegyric upon the Bible, i. e., the Jewish Scriptures, with which he ended, were marvels of beautiful thought and diction. Indeed, under the bewitching spell of his eloquence—if that were all—we could almost have wished we were Jews too!

But that was not all. The courtesies of the occasion—the good Rabbi being the guest of the Club—prevented the saying, by those who were called out afterward, of much that otherwise might very properly have been said. Between the two parts of the address to which I have referred, when speaking of what Modern Thought, called the Higher Criticism, has done for or to the Bible, there was not a little, the rank poison of which could not be disguised to persons of discriminating taste, notwithstanding the delectable rhetorical sugar-coating with which it was served. My loyalty to the Old Book, which I believe to be the Word of God, and not a merely human production seamed and marred with falsehood at that, as well as my obligation to those who were present that come under my ministration, will not allow me to let that teaching pass unchallenged.

"Modern thought" is now a phrase to conjure with. There are many who seem to think that what is new must be true, and what is old is obsolete and should therefore be discarded. Pupils in the school of modern thought seem very ready to bow down to whatever the Aaronic craftsmen of criticism may produce; but there are hosts of men who have been to the Mount of God and have heard His voice, and with that voice ringing in their souls and God enthroned in their hearts, it is not surprising if they look with some contempt on the critical idols offered

them—"these be thy gods, O Israel." If in this discourse I may fail to speak with the sobriety and reverence that are my wont, I beg you to attribute it to the levity, not of the minister, but of the subject.

Let us, first of all, take a view of the School of Modern Thought, which is so conspicuously at the fore.

The Rabbi gave us the names of two men as originators and pioneers in this school as connected with the higher criticism. One was Frederick Augustus Wolf, a noted German, and the date he gave us was 1795. Wolf is famous as a propounder and advocate of what is known among scholars as the Homeric Question, in which the position is taken that the Homer poems, the Iliad and the Odyssey, are not single poems, units, but are made up of a number of poems, troubadour songs, and the like. The principles which he applied to the poems of Homer were applied to the Scriptures, and there was the beginning, practically, of the Higher Criticism.

Let me tell you another story. 163 years before the date given, Baruch Spinoza was born at Amsterdam (1632-1677). He was the son of Jewish parents who fled to Holland from Moorish Spain because of persecution. It is a matter of history that he was suspected of verging towards heresy even before his fifteenth year, and was accused of contemning the law of Moses. Repeated summons of the Synagogue to trial he neglected, and in 1656 the anathema maranatha, or greater excommunication, was pronounced against him. From this point he went on in his philosophical and religious development, evolving from Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am) a full-grown system of pantheism. It is hardly worth while to inquire what he got from Maimonides nearly 500 years before (1135-1204), or from Aben-Ezra. Dr. Willis, author of a Life of Spinoza, published in London in 1870, says: "Spinoza is, in fact, the founder of our modern school of Biblical criticism and exegesis." Some one has called him "the grandfather of the higher criticism." Put Spinoza, then, instead of Wolf, at the head of the school of modern thought with respect to the Bible.

If Spinoza is the grandfather, what about the father?

Another name given us in connection with Wolf was that of Ewald. George H. A. von Ewald was born at Gottingen in 1803, and was perhaps the greatest oriental scholar of this century. He launched, we were told, the higher critical theory of the composite structure of Genesis, and other books of the Bible, according to which they are a compilation made up from different authors and pieced together.

Let us see. In 1684, in Languedoc, France, 119 years before Ewald and 52 years after Spinoza were born, one Jean Astruc first saw the light. He was son of a Protestant pastor, who, in the Catholic persecutions consequent upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, recanted and entered the Catholic church. He had not the stuff of which martyrs are made. Jean studied at the great medical school of Montpellier, became a doctor at 19, and as practitioner, lecturer, professor, his fame was carried by his pupils throughout Europe. At the age of 45, wealthy

and distinguished, he moved to Paris with wife and children, where he immediately entered into the society that was admitted at the royal court. That was the court of Louis XIV., one of the most corrupt and licentious whose leprous story has polluted the pages of history. Astruc became a part of the concern. Seven years later he published his great medical work which brought him still more fame, *De Morbis Venereis*, a work made both appropriate and necessary by the Sodomie set among which as court physician he practiced. Though still living with his family, he formed a connection with the most notorious woman of all Paris, the procuress of the court, and he maintained that illicit relation publicly for 19 years, until her death. Voltaire, that "laughing devil," as he calls himself, describes Astruc as Harpagon Astruc, debauchee, miser, and possessed with a devil. Between times, and probably to take the taste out of his mouth, he studied Scripture. When he was 69 years old he published a work entitled "Conjectures Concerning the Original Memoranda which, it Appears, Moses Used to Compose the Book of Genesis, with Remarks which Support or Throw Light on these Conjectures." The book had this motto from Lucretius: "I pass through the remote regions of the Muses, untrodden by other foot." Not Ewald, but Jean Astruc, is the author of the higher critical theory of the composite structure, the documentary hypothesis of the origin, of Genesis, and the *father* of the higher criticism.

O, ye disciples in the School of Modern Thought! Behold your grandfather, the pantheist Spinoza; and behold your father, the unspeakable Astruc, performing vivisection on the Word of God in his clinic, and then going his Æsculapian rounds ministering at the shrines of Venus!

Now let me tell you something that did not get into the daily papers. I got it from the foremost figure in the scene. In '94 there was a Congress of Baptist scholars at Detroit. Higher criticism was much in evidence. President Harper and other luminaries were there. Howard Osgood, one of the Old Testament Revisers, professor in the Baptist Theological Seminary of Rochester, was also present. When his opportunity came to speak, he read a number of propositions and asked if those correctly represented the position of the higher critics. President Harper or others assented. Then holding up a book he called the attention of his auditors to the fact that propositions he had read were extracts from the writings of the infidel Tom Paine! Consternation and confusion reigned for a time in that Congress. The next day the Associated Press had not heard of it!

By the turning back of a prison door against the wall in Paris and thus concealing a chalk mark, Thomas Paine escaped the guillotine. He returned to this country where he died. All honor to him for the aid he gave the cause of liberty in our early colonial days, by his political writings. He is a political saint, so to speak. But it does not take much of a man for a political saint here, judging from the character of the men that sometimes get elected to office. Notwithstanding he for a

time preached the gospel of Christ as a layman in England, and wished to apply to the Bishop of London for ordination, he went down into infidelity, and went down in it, until his personal character and conduct became absolutely unreportable in a mixed audience. Moncure D. Conway's buckets of whitewash (*Life of Paine*) cannot cover the black spots. Of Mary Roscoe, a Christian woman who kindly ministered to him in his final miserable days, he asked if she had ever read any of his writings and what she thought of them, and said: "From such as you I expect a correct answer." She told him that when very young his *Age of Reason* had been put into her hands, but the more she read in it the more dark and distressed she became, and she threw it into the fire. Paine replied: "I wish all had done as you did, for if the devil ever had any agency in any work, he has had it in my writing that book."

On an anniversary celebration of Paine's death not long ago, Henry Rowley, president of the Brooklyn Philosophical Society, gave the address of welcome, in which he said: "See how things change. The Rev. Mr. Briggs stands to-day much where Paine stood. The only difference is that Paine was a century before him."

In a meeting in the vicinity of Boston, a gray-haired man arose and said: "I have burned my Thomas Paine's works and Voltaire's *Philosophical Dictionary*," and he added, "I obtained more light from them in that way than in any other."

The pantheist, Spinoza, grandfather; the unspeakable Astruc, father; the infidel, Thomas Paine, the elder son, in founding the School of Modern Thought with respect to the Bible! When such men, or those who sympathize with them, assume to be curators of the sacred oracle of my religious beliefs and life, its exegetes and expounders, I pause.

But some one may say: "Dominie, aren't you up to the old trick of trying to excite *odium theologicum*?" That is not what I am after, but simply to show up this school of modern thought. I am reciting history, which, sometimes, is the most damaging thing a man can do. But I am not responsible for the facts.

But you say: "Truth is truth, emanate from what source it may." Certainly, certainly; but the question is as to the truth of the higher critical theories. Assumption is not evidence, nor is assertion proof. These theories are *of course* to be judged on their merits, and not by the character of the men who propound them; but when the "father of lies," or one of his children, propounds to us a theory, I must say the presumption is not altogether in his favor. If you were looking for a school to which to send your children, it would not be at all strange if you should inquire as to the founders of, and instructors in, it; and what you learned respecting them would no doubt influence your estimate of the school, and justly so. We have had a glimpse of the founders of the school of modern thought as respects the Bible.

Before proceeding to speak upon the merits of the critical theories, I must pause to note what I deem to be a mistake on the part of the good Rabbi. He sweetly assured us that the consensus of scholarship

is all in favor of the new views of the Bible, and that the old view, by which I suppose was intended the orthodox view, is decaying; and indeed under his showing it seemed so far decayed as almost to smell bad under our noses. It was with difficulty that I could restrain myself from characterizing his portraiture as a gross caricature,—“a book let down from the clouds out of heaven, dictated by the Almighty.” The names of the distinguished scholars which he gave us as opponents of the old and advocates of the new, we may look at a moment.

I am impressed with the words of Bishop Hurst in his “History of Rationalism: “The first antagonists of Christianity came from without; * * * but the great Coryphaei of rationalism have sprung from the very bosom of the church.” But to the names. Prof. Briggs,—a discredited man, suspended from the Presbyterian ministry for what the highest judicatory of the church declared to be false teaching concerning the Bible. Prof. Henry Preserved Smith,—a discredited man, suspended for the same reason, and cast out of his theological chair. Prof. William Robertson Smith, of Aberdeen, Scotland,—a discredited man, cast out of his theological chair. Prof. Driver, of Oxford. I am unable in my haste to verify a strong impression I have, that he was driven because of his Biblical vagaries from the contributing staff of the Sunday School Times. But Prof. Toy, once professor in the Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, now in Harvard, who is to the Biblical scholarship of this country much what Prof. Driver is to England, began to toy too much with sacred things, and his connection with that paper was severed. Prof. Cheyne, also of Oxford: Well, you can form your estimate of him when I tell you that, in his late work on the Psalms, he utterly repudiates the idea that David wrote even a single psalm! I confess to you that when the Apostle Peter says, Acts 1:16, referring to Ps. 41:9, “Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake,” I prefer to hold with Peter rather than the Professor, even though the Apostle had not the enlightenment furnished by the school of modern thought.

This exhausts the list of American and English names given. As to the German names, it would be interesting and it might be profitable to furnish you data for estimating the value, in this line, of German scholarship so called, by giving you the substance of an article entitled “Yellow” Theologies, in the last October number of the Watchword and Truth, a magazine published in Boston. But time does not permit.

Decayed? At the Presbyterian General Assembly in Minneapolis a year ago last May, in the action on the case of Prof. McGiffert, a committee of twenty-one brought in a report; of the four specifications in which, I give you the first: “In regard to the fundamental doctrines of our church involved in this matter, this Assembly solemnly declare: 1. “It is a fundamental doctrine of the Word of God and the Confession of Faith, that the Holy Spirit did so control the inspired writers in their composition of the Holy Scriptures as to make their statements absolutely truthful, i. e., free from error when interpreted in their natu-

ral and intended sense. All seeming discrepancies and contradictions in the Bible are to be referred to the limitations upon human knowledge. To hold that the Holy Scriptures are in any respect historically inaccurate, is to oppose the teaching of the Confession, Chap. I., Sec. 4, which declares that 'the authority of the Holy Scriptures, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth wholly upon God the author thereof; and therefore is to be received because it is the Word of God' " (Minutes, 1899, p. 96).

That is the old view. How decayed it is, you may infer from the fact that when the vote was taken, the entire Assembly—the roll showed over 700 delegates—rose to their feet in irrepressible enthusiasm, voting unanimously in favor of it. Decayed—dead—corpse? Pretty lively corpse isn't it? If the Presbyterian church, which has stood in the forefront of Christian scholarship in this country, is as a body thus loyal to the Word of God, do you suppose that other evangelical denominations are very much less so?

When a theological professor shoots off on a tangent from his orbit and blazes in the errant sky, attention is called to him by the press from one end of the land to the other; while the other professors, who are content to keep their appointed rounds of regular and safe teaching, do not at all engage the public eye. The uninformed might think that the one professor was "the whole thing;" mistakenly so, however. Accordingly, when the good Rabbi told us that the consensus of scholarship was all his way, I was reminded of a political campaign skit. A man up in Wisconsin wanted to contract with the hotels at the summer resorts to deliver a carload of frog's legs. He could do it, for the ponds and lakes were full of batrachians, as he knew by the noise they made. He fulfilled his contract with a market basket. They made up in noise what they lacked in numbers.

Still, I can see a viewpoint from which the Rabbi may be correct, which is to allow that what he said is a fact, viz.: that to hold the old view is "impossible to a scholar" (emphasis heavy on "scholar"). 'No doubt we are the people, and wisdom shall die with us' (Job 12:2).

But let me say just here that my contention is with the School of Modern Thought, the Higher Criticism, and not at all with the good Rabbi, or only incidentally as he represents that school. And of that school I have in mind the "destructive" critics, which the higher critics mostly are. Their work is well represented in the story of the man who is said to have cut out from his Bible part after part to which his "liberal" pastor objected, until were left only the covers of the book. There are those somewhat remotely affiliated with them called "constructive" critics, the results of whose work so nearly approach the results of the legitimate "lower" criticism, that little if any objection need be offered. Would, however, that they were keeping better company!

To speak at all adequately to the question of the merits of the higher critical theories would require hours of discourse. Possibly I can, in a few minutes, so present two points as to enable you to judge for your-

selves. The one is in regard to the composition of books of the Bible, and the other is in regard to prophecy.

Starting with Astruc's "conjectures," as he modestly called them, concerning the composition of Genesis, but about which the critics are now cock-sure, the theory has been extended to the Pentateuch, or Hexateuch, and indeed to most if not all the books of the entire Bible. Speaking specifically now of the earlier books, according to this theory they are made up from different previous authors (except those that are forged outright), as women and children make up patchwork quilts from different kinds of cloth.

There is a work or document which they called J, by the Jehovist author; another called E, by the Elohist writer; D, by the Deuteronomist; P, by the Priestly writer. They have also J² and E². Then there is R, the Redactor or editor, who made up into one narrative what we now have, from these different writers, himself supplying in addition what he thought best.

I have given you the foregoing seven "sources" simply as a sample. If you wish more, Prof. Briggs can furnish you twelve, Cornill eighteen, Wellhausen twenty; or, you can "help yourself."

President Harper of the Chicago University, perhaps the foremost exponent of the higher criticism in this country, gives this Redactor a pretty hard name. He says of him: "His spirit is far from being a critical one. He did not hesitate to use his material in any way which would best subserve his aim. He inserted and omitted, changed and arranged." He "did not have insight sufficient to enable him to see that he was all the time committing grave blunders, and yet felt no hesitation in altering the originals with which he was working." Poor fellow! he was not educated in the School of Modern Thought! And what a fine thing it is for us that now, centuries upon centuries afterward, we have higher critical gentlemen who can not only tell Mr. Redactor just how he ought to have done it, but can sift out his lies and give us the truth!

Let me give you two illustrations of this compilation theory which I take from Bacon's "Genesis of Genesis," and Bissell's "Genesis Printed in Colors." The colors on the blackboard will help us.

Gen. 21:1.

J "And the Lord visited Sarah as he had said,
P and
R the Lord
P did unto Sarah as he had spoken."

Gen. 37:2, 3.

P "These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph being seventeen years old,

[—]

E was feeding the flock with his brethren; and he was a lad

E² with the sons of Billah, and with the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives;

E and Joseph brought the evil report of them unto their father.

J Now Israel loved Joseph," etc.

The brackets above indicate, according to Prof. Bacon, "missing material;" something that the naughty Redactor ought to have put in! From such pre-existing sources these verses were compiled.

You may ask where the critics get proof of all this. I give it up. I suspect they get it where spiders get their webs. If you can believe that any sane man ever wrote history in this crazy-quilt, dolly-var-den style, you have a power of belief that I am destitute of. My faculty for that is represented by brackets! As I have read their voluminous writings, I am impressed that a method of theirs is this: Assume what you want, and deny what you don't want.

At a commencement of the Chicago University, President Harper, Prof. Galusha Anderson (once pastor of the Second Baptist church in St. Louis), and Prof. Northrup each made an address, one following the other. Prof. Anderson's address was notable, considering his "environment." Said he: "When a man says, taking for instance an account like that of Rahab and the spies, that the one who wrote that took three lines out of one manuscript which he had in his hand, and then six words out of another, and then two or three verses out of another, and then half a verse out of another, and shows all this to me by letters of different colors on the page, and I look it over; I say to myself that no mortal man who ever put two ideas together ever wrote in that way since the foundation of this world." And considering the place, it is significant that ringing applause followed his utterance.

The theory of different documents in Genesis apparently started from the use of different names for God, as Elohim in the first story of creation, and Jehovah in the second. We were told at the Club that between these two stories there are "absolute contradictions." Many, many times I have read these two accounts, both in the English and Hebrew, and I have not seen such differences. The speaker has mistaken variations for contradictions. There are variations, of course, because the two were written from different standpoints and with different purpose.

In the Homiletic Review for 1898 (Aug. and Sept.), the late Prof. Green, of Princeton, has two articles on "Elohim and Jehovah in the Pentateuch." He examines every occurrence of these names, and gives a good and sufficient reason for their particular use. At the close of the first article (p. 171) he says, what he could just as pertinently have said at the close of the second: "An examination of the facts thus far has shown that the critical hypothesis of different documents is not required to explain the different uses of the Divine names, and is not in accord with that use. It proposes a superficial, mechanical, and unsatisfactory solution, while it overlooks or disregards the real key to the whole matter, which readily offers itself, in the signification and use of the words themselves." And elsewhere he says that this theory finds no support in the Pentateuch itself, but is "simply the creation of learned ingenuity and a lively imagination" ("The Unity of the Book of Genesis," p. VI).

After years of consideration, I give you as my candid judgment,

this: The theory of the documentary origin of Genesis as resting on the use of different names for God, ought to be laughed out of court; and I believe the time is coming when it will be. Judge ye of the merits of the composite theory.

The late Dr. Mendenhall, editor of the *Methodist Review*, kept track of the theories he saw applied, since 1850, to the origin and authorship of the books of the Bible, by the higher critics. To the Old Testament books, 539; to the New, 208; total 747. He says: "Of the 747 theories, 603 are defunct, and many of the remaining 144 are in the last stages of degeneracy and dissolution." Why so many dead, do you ask? Slain by the critics themselves. Their mutual internecine is marvellous. Ewald calls the Tübingen professor, Baur, "no Christian at all, but worse than a heathen" (*Life of Philip Schaff*, p. 21). Baur returns the missile by calling Ewald's periodical the "Magazine of Theological Passion" in place of "Magazine of Biblical Science," its real name. The boulders that some of these beloved brethren heave at each other, would make Bret Harte's chunks of old red sandstone that interrupted the proceedings of the Stanislaus Society seem, in comparison, like pellets of dough. Why, a pair of these combatants sometimes remind me of the two belligerent serpents that are said to have commenced head to tail to swallow each other, and when they got through there wasn't anything left of either. Let the good work go on!

At the Club, the Jewish prophets were left in exceedingly bad plight. One hardly knows which to wonder at the more: the morality which they inculcated, or the mendacity with which they inculcated it. They certainly claimed to speak directly for God, and also by a foresight divinely imparted to foretell future events; but their claim was false! So avers the school of modern thought.

Prof. Pfeleiderer says: "In Hebrew prophecy there was nothing beyond the reach of man's natural faculties." In an editorial in "The Biblical World", for September, 1898, p. 152. President Harper says: "Prophecy was the interpretation of history. * * * Let us not forget that the history preceded: that the object-lesson came first. Prophecy, or the practical application of the lesson, followed, and was built upon the history."

To a letter which I wrote, embodying the above quotation, and asking if, from that point of view, predictive prophecy were possible, and, if so, how; President Harper replied: "In answer to your question upon the editorial in the *Biblical World*. I would say predictive prophecy is, of course, possible, because the writer, knowing the laws in accordance with which God acted, could foretell the result of any particular course of conduct. Predictive prophecy was constantly used in order, if possible, to affect the life and conduct of the people. Hoping that this is clear, I remain, yours very truly."

Entirely clear. Plainly, there was no divine element in such prophecy giving it Divine authentication: it was only human. Accordingly, prophecy did come "in old time by the will of man," St. Peter

to the contrary notwithstanding (I Pet. 1:21). "Holy men of old spake," not "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," as Peter said they did, but as they were moved by their own pious prescience or sanctified shrewdness. Noah could not have been "warned of God" (Heb. 11:7) objectively, to prepare an ark for the saving of his house, but "moved" by a subjective impression, the result of his meteorological knowledge of "the laws in accordance with which God acted," his weather-eye saw the storm coming while it was yet 120 years off, and in due time he got in out of the wet. Why, Noah must have been an antediluvian weather-bureau in comparison with which "Old Probabilities" at Washington, to use both a classical and scriptural expression, is not "in it." If, in a somewhat extended inside investigation of Spiritualism, I had not come to the conclusion that it is a compound of delusion and demonism, I would suggest that some of you gentlemen, who are acquainted with Dr. Hyatt, of the St. Louis weather-bureau, intimate to him it would be a good thing to visit a spiritual medium and call up the ghost of Noah, and get some pointers from him on weather prognostication!

Judge for yourselves of the merits of the higher critical theory of prophecy.

One of the questions asked at the Club meeting was: "Does the view of the Bible which has been presented, exclude the supernatural?" The answer was "No." Then: "Is the higher criticism simply the doctrine of Evolution applied to the Scriptures?" "Yes," was the reply. These answers indicate a theistic evolutionist, i. e., one who admits God, the supernatural, to begin with; for there must be a first cause. But if it had then been asked, "Does this view admit the subsequent intervention of the supernatural?" the answer must have been "No;" for the speaker could not have said "Yes," and yet be a consistent evolutionist. The higher critic, Kuenen, who was mentioned with approval, says: "So long as we allow the supernatural to intervene even in a single point, so long our view of the whole continues to be incorrect." This, of course, excludes all belief in, and consideration of, miracles. If there be no supernatural in the world, there has been no revelation from God, for that would be a miracle. It does not take much intelligence to see where this lands the Bible.

Another name for evolution is "natural development." A favorite theory is that the Bible, like the sacred books of the non-Christian religions, is the outgrowth, the product, of the "religious consciousness" of the race. They apply the word "inspiration" to the Bible, oh, yes, and to the other books as well; yea, also to the works of genius, so-called, like Homer, Virgil, Shakspeare, Milton, Goethe. The inspiration differs not in kind, but simply in degree. I was not at all surprised, therefore, to hear one present, who signified his acceptance of evolution applied to theology, say that it is a mistake to regard the canon of the Bible as closed, for as God inspired prophets and apostles of old, so He speaks by inspiration through men now! That sounds very like Prof. Herron, who left his professorial chair for the good of the institution: "I try

to show that inspiration is the only final and normal condition of human life; that holy men of old were inspired to the end that all humanity might be finally inspired." When Prof. Drummond was asked in what sense the first chapters of Genesis are true, he replied, "In the same sense in which George Macdonald's poem, 'Where did you come from, baby dear?' is true." Is that the kind of inspired Bible you want? According to your faith be it unto you. None of that for me, please.

The Old Testament as we have it is just what Christ had, and He set the seal of his divine sanction to it from beginning to end. As Prof. Howard Osgood well says: "If this criticism is true, Christ was the greatest of false prophets and deceivers. If Christ taught God's truth, this criticism is absolutely false."

I declare to you that I would, from the spiritual point of view, give more for what we are getting from Mr. Newell, at the Union Bible class in St. Louis, than I would give for the entire output of the higher critical school for the last twenty-five years.

It is expected that a minister's sermon shall have some connection with his text. God said, "Thou shalt surely die." The devil said, "Thou shalt not surely die." The higher criticism denies every feature that makes the Bible distinctively and supernaturally the Word of God. Years ago I heard an address at a Sunday-school convention, in which the word "development" occurred a number of times. The speaker was a foreigner, and, not having got his tongue around our words very well yet, he pronounced it as though it were spelled devil-ope-ment. * * *

While you may think I have not treated this subject as seriously as I ought, i. e., with as much gravity, there is a sadness in my heart that makes it nigh to breaking. Oh, the effect of the teaching of the higher criticism upon Christian belief and life! Missionaries who have gone to foreign lands have left their fields: they no longer had a saving gospel from God to preach. Ministers have left their pulpits. Theological students have turned their backs on a vocation to which they were consecrated by a godly father and mother. Pastors have had loved parishioners come to them and say: "I have lost my faith in the Bible because of what I have heard and read. If theological professors are so at sea in regard to it, how can we know? I don't know what to believe. I have lost my grip. It isn't honest for me to profess a faith I do not believe. I wish my name taken from the church-roll." How many, many, pastors have had such an experience as this.

God pity these distressed souls. I know how they feel. I, myself, came near leaving the theological seminary and throwing up the whole thing. But, blessed be God, I afterward came to certitude, and now I *know* whereof I doubted; and so I have been able to help other troubled ones.

But if you have any tears to shed, prepare to shed them now. Here is one of the saddest things, in its way, that has ever come to my knowledge. Dr. Pentecost, in his article, "After Mr. Moody, What?" in The Evangelist of last August 30, says: "One of the most distinguished

scholars of the advanced school of Higher Criticism frankly confessed to me that his conversion and present peace with God were based on the vicarious and substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, and that even now in daily asking for the forgiveness of sins he always appealed to the divine sacrifice of Christ as evangelicals understand it. At the same time he declared that he could not, himself, preach *that* gospel, on account of its unphilosophical and unscientific character."

For his own peace and salvation he still depends on the old faith, which perhaps he learned at his mother's knee; but he can, himself, no longer preach it to others!

Parents, you have children to rear. What sort of a Bible are you bringing them up on? What book do you put in their trunks when they leave home?

A boy is about to leave the dear old home nest. He must go out and do a man's work, and make for himself a place and a name. He goes to bid his father goodbye. They kneel, and the father with broken and tear-filled voice commends the son of his love to God and the word of his grace. He goes to the mother's room to bid her goodbye. They kneel, and she commits him to the God who has been and is her stay and hope. In the world to which he is going he needs a sufficient and authoritative guide, that which shall indeed be "a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path." A Bible is given him: the Bible of Modern Thought, think you? or the Bible which is distinctively and divinely inspired, far and away above all, the very Word of God?

Says the Psalmist, "Forever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in heaven" (119:89). Says the Son of God, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all shall be fulfilled" (Matt. 5:18). "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35).

"We've travelled together, my Bible and I,
Through all kinds of weather, with smile or with sigh;
In sorrow or sunshine, in tempest or calm,
Thy friendship unchanging, my lamp and my psalm.

"We've travelled together, my Bible and I,
When life has grown weary, and death e'en was nigh;
But all through the darkness of mist or of wrong,
I found thee a solace, a prayer or a song.

"So now who shall part us, my Bible and I?
Shall isms or schisms, or new lights who try?
Shall shadows for substance, or stone for good bread
Supplant thy sound wisdom, give folly instead?

"Ah, no, my dear Bible, exponent of light,
Thou sword of the Spirit, put error to flight;
And still through life's journey, until my last sigh,
We'll travel together, my Bible and I."





BS500 .B32
The Bible in the light of modern thought

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00043 1090